

December 2004 - External Stakeholders Meetings

(No written comments were received)

Meeting 12/16/04

Attendees: Gerard Hamblin
Brian Tippetts
Annie Tippetts
Dave Lundberg
Chuck Larsheid
Sue Bangert and Mike Degen

Context and Overview

General Comments:

- Vision: Problem w/ vision – not clear enuf, “Moving towards” is too vague, leaves a cloud. Just say “0 waste” if that’s our vision.
- Where did categories on the improvement opportunities matrix come from?
- What do we do now, relative to the options listed in the Grid?

Themes in the Grid (MD) IT
Communications
Regulatory Reform
Beyond Compliance

- Somewhere should compare current to proposed

MANAGEMENT SYSTEM COMMENTS

PLAN REVIEW

- Define what is meant by complex in the technical review (environmental risk, technical, consistency) - complexity will be different depending on whether its based on environmental risk vs technical. Consistent decisions need to be top priority. Functionally, landfills or complex sites should be managed centrally.
- Decentralized plan review is good because understanding of local situations and the facility at a local level. This also should be included as a measure.
- Central control results in more consistency around the state, decentralized control results in better understanding of the local situation.
- Regions may not determine something as precedent setting, and so the questions aren’t asked of the bureau. This leads to inconsistency.
- Sympathy may exist at the local level for trying something different that isn’t supported in the central office.
- With 2, don’t have a champion for the project, to get it done. With multiple places for review, don’t have accountability.
- Locals are more around and available for meetings, better for communications.
- Local connection and relationships are important and need to be addressed as part of the redesign, along with consistency and workload. The take away is that relationships need to be built (irrespective of whether its at the local level or centrally located).
- Trust is an issue, consistency is an issue. Figure out how to support those without totally centralized, or decentralized.
- Match skills to plan review needs. If a person can do a certain task well, have them do that more often.
- What is important is what it looks like on the ground (from the facilities perspective) – the relationship that exists between the DNR staff and the facility.

- Consistency around the sediment issue was solved through defining a point of contact and process.
- As long as we (DNR) can address why there is an inconsistency, the inconsistency may be less of a problem.

INSPECTIONS

- Specialist vs generalist: It helps staff to be more rounded if they can do more than just one specialty (example: plan review staff)
- Annual evaluation should credit staff that reach out and try new things, rather than doing just one thing.
- Need to address those that don't have the skill sets, don't put people in situations that cause stress and can't do the job. May not want to tackle the personnel issue. Let them do a different job.
- People in Madison need to have more field experience – they aren't broad enough in their thinking. Regional people seem to better understand the situation.
- If self-certify, then eliminate the duplication – the audits, annual reports, etc.

POLICY

- Lack of consistent policy across media (air, water, land) – evaluate consistency in rules.
- Have we talked to the governor's office about the blue ribbon task forces?
- Outreach – is this where we can partner with stakeholders: example: Asphalt shingle recycling - DNR should be evaluated in how they did in the partnership and getting to an outcome (whether we say yes or no, get to the end point in a timely fashion)

ENFORCEMENT

- Wrt = with respect to
- Citation authority – we're closest in the open burning area. Is it similar to the asbestos citation? Its similar to littering citations.

TECH. ASST.

- Should DNR be at the table as a member of some of the trade associations? They would be able to hear what is going on at the table of their meetings. The meetings would be more constructive – more give and take.

COMPLAINT RESPONSE

- Good luck in making changes!
- Categorize complaints – really need to respond. For some categories, in order to have a DNR on-site visit, need to have a state representative lodge the complaint.

DATA USE

- No comments.

STRUCTURE COMMENTS

Option 1

- Leave the staffing numbers off the table – may be interpreted in the wrong way.
- Where did the IT section come from as an equal section – usually a support function? Focus on the IT
- Are there other organizations that are using IT in a similar way in which we have proposed? Recent information suggests that only ~18% of users are satisfied with the IT tools being used in this way, so how do we make it work for the users so that we can get better satisfaction and achieve the efficiencies?

Option 2

- Is the IT section of opt. 1 the same as the administrative section in #2? No, some differences. If similar, use the same name.

- In county structure, the most efficient units are the front-line. Less efficient are the internal support (like IT). In option 1, only 1 group deals with the public. In option 2, 2 groups have to deal with the public. Keeping IT separate makes them less public and less accountable. They don't have a good sense of deadlines, etc. IT should be subordinate to the front-line, don't need another co-equal group that takes 7 weeks to do something that the front-line staff need to something in 2 weeks. Need the accountability.
- Allow the other sections have an evaluation function of the IT/admin.
- Have 2 sections – program and admin./IT.
- Efficient service, relationships, out at the facility - don't really care about the structure. Really want accountability.
- The real proof will be in the implementation and in seeing results and improvements.